## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

から、世帯の最高に

CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION

# Enforcement of Court Desegregation Orders

UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI

Meredith v. Fair

Trial Files

Transcripts - U. S. v. Barnett -Johnson

lawyers and the New York lawyers all come down to New Orleans, and you all have to come from wherever your business takes you in the District, when you are not losing -- if there is any fear that the Mississippi District Courts won't properly perform their duty, you still have -- any time your mandate is tampered with -- let's see (referring to document) -- here is what the Supreme Court said -- this is in the brief, so I won't give you the citation -- it's on page 26 of the brief, They are talking now about the Supreme Court's own mandate. They said:

"It is for the district court to
which the mandate is directed to construe
and execute such mandate; and if that
court (1) misconstrues or (2) refuses to
enforce it or (3) attempts to 'vary it'
or (4) 'to intermeddle with it,'" (Arabic
numbers in parentheses added)

then the Supreme Court can step right back in and enforce the mandate in any way they want it enforced. -

JUDGE BROWN: But isn't it ludicrous, assuming we had the power to enter the order of July 28th and that there is strong indication shown by the proof now again in the record that it is not being obeyed, isn't it ludicrous that we have to refer to the District Court to take appropriate action to see that our orders are carried out?

MR. CLARK: No, sir, for this reason:

JUDGE BROWN: Do you think the Supreme Court of the United States would ever turn to a district court to enforce its orders?

MR. CLARK: I think that this is exactly what the Supreme Court said in the Union Steamboat case. That is why you have district courts. They have the machinery to deal with just exactly this; they are permanently there in that particular district, they are on the ground; that is their function. This Court is an appellate court, and I say to you that it was entirely improper for the Government to use this Court as the vehicle in which it would seek to enforce this right that it claims that it has as an amicus, which it could have brought in a completely separate and independent action.

JUDGE BROWN: You think this Court, assuming validity of the July 28th order and the present showing is adequate for preliminary injunction, has the power to issue a preliminary injunction which by its terms remands that injunction to the District Court for further enforcement?

MR. CLARK: I suggest so, sir, and I would say this: If you have the apprehension that Judge Jones has -- I have a difficulty in my mind that apparently doesn't exist in this Court's minds, because you say that this order of the 28th has not been complied with or that no proof has been

made that it has been complied with, and I say that everybody that was directed to has shown to the Court to have complied with it, and I will assure you as an officer of this Court that they have absolutely and fully. In complete good faith and with regard to Judge Wisdom's remark with regard to good faith of those who testified, I would like to remind Your Honors -- excuse me for saying this -- Judge Tuttle, you told me one time when I got before this Court I could argue as strong as I wanted to. I hope I still have that permission.

JUDGE TUTTLE: Yes, sir.

MR. CLARK: -- that Mr. Ellis, the Registrar, testified to that Court that if any qualified Megro applicant applied for admission that he would be admitted, and as an aside the next day Counsel for Appellant wanted to know if he was still the Registrar, and you know he still is, and he has never ever varied from that. The only time that he did not do so is when he thought that he was powerless to do so, and apparently this Court agreed with him.

JUDGE WISDOM: Now I don't want to continue this argument, because it is tangential, but my remark was directed to the fact that he testified that he was shocked and surprised that anybody would think the University of Mississippi would turn down a qualified Negro. I say that casts a doubt on his sincerity, but let's pass that, because

it is tangential.

MR. CLARK: I don't recall that, and, of course, they --

JUDGE WISDOM: I recall it distinctly.

MR. CLARK: -- said that they had never met and considered --

JUDGE TUTTLE: Counsel stood here in this courtroom and repeatedly urged on us the proposition that there
was no showing that the University of Mississippi was a
segregated institution. Now somebody, either counsel or
witnesses, came up with that fanciful -- I say fanciful -proposition, and I say fanciful especially in the light of
the evidence that has been proved in this case now.

MR. CLARK: Judge, you are talking about the temper of individual citizens when you are talking about the purposes or the things that led to the unfortunate events at the University of Mississippi on that Sunday night.

JUDGE TUTTLE: No, Mr. Clark. I am talking about the fact that this Court had to get into a case on the fact issue. Counsel made this Court get into the fact issue as to whether Ole Miss is segregated or not, and that fact issue ought never to have come to this Court. In some way or other, in some way or other, if everybody had answered honestly and faithfully, it seems to me that that issue could never have come to this Court as a fact issue. Now that is

all I had to say about what I --

MR. CLARK: I disagree with you, because -JUDGE TUTTLE: You have the right to do so.

MR. CLARK: -- because the question with regard to whether the University is segregated is one question that we didn't attempt to interject into the case. The question that we interjected in the case was whether there was a state policy under which the University was being kept segregated as opposed to the fact that there never had been a qualified Negro applicant that had been refused, and, of course, we took the fact position that this man was not.

argument, as I understand it, that the orders of the Court have been complied with, it seems to me -- I can't get it in my mind, but the order of the Court not only directs his admission to the University but directs his continued attendance thereafter at the University on the same basis as other students who attend the University.

MR. CLARK: Absolutely.

JUDGE RIVES: Now do you think that has been complied with?

MR. CLARK: Absolutely, to the very letter.

JUDGE RIVES: Do you think other students have to walk around with a marshal to protect them and be jeered at and halloaed at as they go about the campus?

MR. CLARK: Judge, in your question whether or not the people that you directed this injunction to and the people that you could direct this injunction to have complied with your orders, there is not a man --

JUDGE BROWN: What about the Dean? Why don't they exercise some discipline over students that act this way?

MR. CLARK: As near as I know, sir, they are exercising all the discipline they can.

hands of the Attorney General. I don't know on what basis, but that is what I am told. The only reason I can refer to these things is that your argument -- we had a condition in our decree, and we did -- that that condition has been met. The evidence offered by the Government shows that on such and such a date these things were transpiring and that there was a need for an injunction, as we could judge from the fact that there are troops there. You have made no effort to prove that conditions, that those conditions in that decree, have been fully met. Now if you want to establish that it is no longer operative by its own terms, it seems to me that it was incumbent upon you to demonstrate that by facts. I don't know where you have shown it.

MR. CLARK: I say this, sir: The problem is not a factual one in my mind, it is a legal one, because the Court already has the possession of the factual knowledge

that the state officials -- you can't enjoin any individual citizen to like or not like somebody, you can't enjoin him to like red-headed girls.

JUDGE BELL: At least we haven't tried that so far.

JUDGE TUTTLE: The Trustees have the power to

expel students who do not comport with the legal requirements
of citizens of the State of Mississippi.

MR. CLARK: They certainly do.

JUDGE TUTTLE: Have they done any of that?

MR. CLARK: They certainly have.

JUDGE TUTTLE: Have you produced any evidence to that effect?

MR. CLARK: No, sir.

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE TUTTLE: Or that they are trying in any way to control the riotous conduct of students on the campus of Ole Miss? Have you any evidence to that effect to show us now?

MR. CLARK: No, sir.

JUDGE TUTTLE: This is what Judge Brown is asking.

been complied with because with force and arms Meredith was taken to the campus and there protected while he was registering, and has since been protected while he has been attending classes? Are we to assume then that that has been a full compliance with this Court's injunctive order?

MR. CLARK: I say, sir, that that is absolutely a compliance with this Court's injunctive order against these parties. They were required to admit Meredith on the same terms and conditions applicable to other students, and they have done that. You didn't tell --

JUDGE GEWIN: Mr. Clark, you are saying that the things that happened are things that nobody in Mississippi can stop, I assume; that he has been admitted and enrolled and the terms of the decree of July 28th have been complied with. Now whether the students continue to jeer or dislike or fuss is something really that the parties-respondent in this case cannot control.

MR. CLARK: Except unless, as Judge Tuttle said, if the University officials are making some exception that they are letting students misbehave on the campus with regard to Meredith but not letting them misbehave with regard to other students on the campus, then they would be treating him differently, but that is not so.

JUDGE TUTTLE: There is no proof of that.

MR. CLARK: I say, sir, as far as proof is concerned, that is not my burden.

JUDGE WISDOM: Do I understand you to say they are treating him on the same basis because there is no evidence they have not treated other students the same way? Is that what you are saying?

MR. CLARK: No, sir. I say to you under the injunctive order of this Court, that is all they were required to do. And I say that the pendency clause of your injunctive order has determined by its own terms.

JUDGE JONES: Would you say if the Federal troops and the United States Marshals were to forthwith depart from Oxford and its vicinity that the State of Mississippi would undertake to give Meredith the protection that he apparently now requires?

MR. CLARK: I am not in any position whatsoever to say that for any --

JUDGE JONES: Of course not.

MR. CLARK: -- party on this motion or any motion in the lawsuit.

JUDGE TUTTLE: And what is the duty of the Court in the light of that fact? What is the duty of this Court? The duty of this Court is to carry out its order, to see that he is maintained on that campus without being killed or damaged to his personal injury, and since no one can guarantee to this Court that this will be done in the absence of an injunction, what is the duty of this Court under those circumstances?

MR. CLARK: Judge Tuttle, I'd say this -- and you have asked me a very frank question, almost put me on the other side of the lectern -- it would be, in my opinion,

DIETRICH & WITT . Stenotypists . Mat'l Bank of Commerce Bidg. . New Orleans

if it is worried about an interval of a day or five days of suspension of an injunctive order against others, I would say use your power of mandate to refer this matter back to the District Court with an injunction in that regard, but I do say to you -- and you ask me what your duty is -- I am talking about your power -- your duty is to your oath; your power is under the jurisdiction that has been vested in you by Congress, and, of course, I wouldn't attempt to tell you how to do the other.

JUDGE TUTTLE: Of course, I mean the duty under our power and oath of office. I don't mean to say what can we do as people acting like judges. I say: What is our duty under the law and the facts of this case?

MR. CLARK: It would be, if you have the idea or if you are convinced legally that your order of the 28th does continue, I would suggest that the proper function of this Court would be to get rid of this lawsuit, as I believe you should have gotten rid of it two or three weeks ago, by keeping your injunction in effect and keeping any other ancillary or amended injunction that you deem proper in effect until such time as you can get a mandate or direction back to the District Court.

JUDGE JONES: I thought you said they were all gone already.

MR. CLARK: I thought that was what was worrying

you, sir. I made that point with you because I think it is correct.

JUDGE JONES: If it has disappeared, then how do we keep it operative until we can mandate the District Court into doing what you say we are no longer able to do?

MR. CLARK: No, I don't say you are no longer able to control the District Court if you find today -- excuse me -- I got so interested I went ahead and talked.

JUDGE JONES: We can't do it -- we can't do it nunc pro tunc as of the date you tell us our injunctive order expired?

MR. CLARK: No, sir, but you can do it instantaneously with the time that you agree with me by virtue of your control of the District Court. In other words, the instant that you accept my legal arguments and enter an order to that effect, your injunction is outstanding, and, if anybody is going to test it, they have got to presume that you have no jurisdiction to enter it, and nobody is testing it, but, if you are going to hold that your appellate jurisdiction over this case has ended, then I think instantaneously with that order you could mandamus the District Court to do that which you thought was necessary to effectuate the mandate that you sent down to him already, which would be to immediately instruct him to forthwith issue his temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction. It would have to be a

there wouldn't be any notice of it until such time as he could notify and have a hearing under the rule, but to immediately enter a temporary restraining order and say (a), (b), (c) what this Court thinks has to be done to preserve the effect of its judgment, because really this is not an appellate matter any more. That is exactly the argument we are making.

JUDGE JONES: You say the mechanics are in the District Courts of Mississippi --

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir.

JUDGE JONES: -- which has discretionary power to grant or refuse and may not feel the same way this Court has indicated it felt in the way of discretion, and then it's back with us again?

MR. CLARK: If that is so, Judge Jones, the two remedies that you have are both mandamus, and, if you accept Land vs. Dollar as a valid case -- and we question its validity -- the Government has accepted it as a valid authority -- based on the Toledo Scale case you could pop another injunction from this Court or rather a citation for contempt, because the order of the District Court was not complied with. You are not going to give up this case by giving up appellate jurisdiction at that point. That is the point I want to convince you of, if you are concerned about

somebody's personal safety.

JUDGE BELL: We couldn't give it up, because, if we did, we wouldn't have any jurisdiction now. If we have got jurisdiction now, we are going to have it next week, next month, next year, so long as this case is pending.

MR. CLARK: This Court?

JUDGE BELL: Right.

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir.

JUDGE BELL: So there is no question about that. What you are arguing is that we ought to make up whatever kind of order we want to make up, either the one we have or another one, send it back to the District Court and tell the District Court to enter this, that this is our mandate, do this?

MR. CLARK: And until such time as he enters it that it is the order of this Court.

JUDGE BELL: That is what you are arguing?
MR. CLARK: Yes, sir.

JUDGE BROWN: If we can do that much, could we go the next step and write out the decree in the same terms as we would ourselves and direct him to enter it as an injunction against these other parties?

MR. CLARK: That is what the Court, I believe, referred to in Land vs. Dollar, that they had done. It was entered in their own words, and thereafter a violation of

DIETRICH & WITT • Stenotypists • Mat1 Bank of Commerce Bidg. • New Orleans

#### 

that injunction constituted a violation of the Court ('s order), and I am trying to disabuse your minds of procedural problems that are bothering you, but I do want it to be clearly understood that my legal presentation to the Court is that your appellate jurisdiction has already expired.

JUDGE TUTTLE: That being so, I wonder -- we have done most of the talking -- this is obvious -- you have answered questions -- I wonder if you don't feel we now have fully in mind your legal proposition.

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir.

JUDGE TUTTLE: I don't want to cut you off a minute, but if, in fact, you believe that we understand what your points are --

MR. CLARK: May I make just some very brief -- I think you are right, sir.

JUDGE TUTTLE: I think some of us don't agree with you at the present time, but I do believe we understand.

MR. CLARK: And I am showing, in the event you don't agree with me, what alternative you should pursue.

JUDGE BROWN: I wanted your views. In your brief you do a wonderful job, I think, on this proposition that that part of the July 28th order which sought to cover anybody who had any knowledge of it is a legal nullity in effect.

MR. CLARK: Right.

JUDGE BROWN: Now, accepting that, doesn't that make it essential then that to make our decree in the main case effective, there needs to be some kind of ancillary order to require people, whether or not parties to that original act, to not interfere with its enforcement? That would be the Governor or --

MR. CLARK: Judge, you bring up a point that was worrying me the whole time that the Government was arguing, and this is an entirely different facet that I had not intended to get into with the Court, but you have decided a lawsuit -- you haven't passed a law, and this Honorable Court can't do it -- and I emphasize my argument with this statement, that the Supreme Court of the United States approved, that it had been decided by this Court, so that the question could no longer be considered an open one there, it was not an infraction of the Fourteenth Amendment for a state to require separate but equal accommodations for the two races. Now that came from McCabe vs. Atchison & Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 235 U. S. 151.

There is no such thing as a final decree of this Court, and I don't know what the Government is going to say in closing, but they didn't make any presentation to Your Honors in the opening of what they wanted in the injunction. We didn't have a chance, of course, to be heard on the injunction itself before, but there are many things in here

which intrude upon the sovereignty of the State of
Mississippi far beyond any necessity of this case of
Meredith vs. Pair. I think that this Court must always
be aware that it can't be the vehicle through which the
judiciary becomes more important than the executive, and
it shouldn't be the vehicle by which the rights of a
sovereign state are deridden.

15 REPORTER'S NOTE:

No hiatus here; copy follows from line 7 above to page 108,

18 line 1.

10

11

12

13

14

19

· 20

21

22

23

DIFTRICH & WITT . Stenotypists . Nat'l Bank of Commerce Bidg. . New Orie

JUDGE JONES: You mean -- is that again suggesting the doctrine of interposition?

MR. CLARK: No, sir, no, sir, I am not before you now arguing interposition. I don't propose to get within miles of that direction. I understand your position is final and unyielding on the doctrine of interposition. I don't argue it.

JUDGE JONES: I didn't otherwise understand your reference with respect to the action of the judicial upon the executive.

MR. CLARK: To this extent, sir: I believe that your authority as a court is to tell the executive department, whether it be of a state or of your own federal branch of the government, only that it cannot intrude upon judicial prerogatives, but this Court in this case has ordered the arrest of Governor Barnett.

JUDGE BELL: Well, we pretty near had a war. That is all we did, we issued an order, a formal court order, which you'd think anybody would obey, at least until they could get an appeal heard, and what happened? A war started pretty near. We had people defying the court order.

JUDGE JONES: Two people are dead.

JUDGE BELL: And two people are dead. I don't understand that argument. We haven't done anything more than a court is supposed to do. We issued our order; that

is what we are supposed to do, as I understand it, under our duties. We issued the order, and then defiance starts of the order, even before the appeal is determined.

MR. CLARK: Now may I comment on what I was going to say?

JUDGE BELL: Yes.

MR. CLARK: Here is what happened: This Court entered an order in a lawsuit that said that James Meredith was entitled to go to the University of Mississippi. The Governor of the State of Mississippi said, I have got an executive power here, a discharge of a duty that I think requires me to interpose or to step in the way, or whatever you want to call it -- Moyer vs. Peabody, 212 U.S. 78 -- and I paraphrase it slightly at the beginning so I won't have to read so long:

There are times when the ordinary rights of individuals must yield to what he, the head of the state, deems the necessity of the moment. Public danger warrants a substitution of executive processes for judicial processes.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter in Feiner vs. New York,

340 U.S. 268, said:

" • • • It is not a constitutional principle that in acting to preserve

order the police must proceed against the crowd, whatever its size and temper, and not against the speaker.

And I think that that same rule would apply to the Governor.

Let's say at this time that you had an order to put him in;

Governor Barnett said, I use the executive prerogative that

JUDGE JONES: What he could have done is say, I will use my executive power to put him in.

MR. CLARK: But he did not.

JUDGE JONES: He did not.

is in me to say he can't go in.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CLARK: He said exactly the opposite. He took a contrary position to the order of this Court.

JUDGE TUTTLE: And then after service on him restrained him from doing the very thing he was doing, he ignored that order.

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir.

JUDGE TUTTLE: And what should we then do under those circumstances under our system of government? It is only the interposition statute or under the interposition theory that would prevent us from going the next step, is it not, and finding him in contempt of court?

MR. CLARK: No, sir. I don't think that the Governor of the State of Mississippi -- we are on the last

part of the argument -- I don't think that the Governor can be in contempt of the Court. I think any time he interferes with what you have said is a valid right that an individual possesses -- James Meredith was declared by this Court to have the right to attend the University of Mississippi. The Governor says that he does not have that right. Then this Court said, Arrest the Governor unless he shows that he has changed his mind about what he said.

JUDGE BELL: No, we didn't say that.

JUDGE WISDOM: Let's assume you are right the first time as to the original order ordering Meredith admitted to the University. Is he right to ignore the second order, which restrains him specifically from interfering with the order of the Court?

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir, because --

JUDGE WISDOM: Isn't that a different case?

MR. CLARK: That is my point, Judge, it is a different case, and he had no chance to litigate it. I say that when he got in the way of that court order, there were two things that could have been done.

JUDGE WISDOM: He had the same chance as any private individual has when there is a restraining order.

MR. CLARK: No, sir.

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE JONES: Did he attempt to litigate that issue in this Court?

MR. CLARK: No, sir.

×

JUDGE JONES: He dropped the summons on the ground and said that he was not subject to the jurisdiction of this Court. Isn't that what he said?

MR. CLARK: No, sir. There was not an opportunity for him to litigate the question against him in this Court, but only to respond to a citation for contempt.

JUDGE JONES: Did anybody ever make any effort to bring him before the Court?

MR. CLARK: No, but you didn't say to try your lawsuit here or try your issues here or why are you doing this, is it for the peace and order of the State.

JUDGE BELL: We said, Show cause why you should not be adjudged in contempt. He can show anything under the sun if he'd just come here before this Court and give his reasons. He could say, I am a Governor, you have no right to proceed against me. He could raise any type of defense he wanted to raise, but he didn't come. In spite of that, we gave him five more days to decide what he wanted to do, and he decided to obey the court order. At least I understand he did from the argument you made down here last week. I was not here.

MR. CLARK: I said this, sir --

JUDGE BELL: But he had about five days before he was to appear and show cause.

MR. CLARK: The point that we made with the Court 2 the other day was that the Governor had not violated the injunction of this Court.

JUDGE BELL: I didn't hear the argument.

MR. CLARK: And he was not guilty of contempt of this Court at that time because of anything that he had done or left undone.

JUDGE WISDOM: I think you also said that he would comply with the order of the Court.

MR. CLARK: I said subject to his oath of office, yes, air, and he will.

JUDGE BELL: Well, --

10

11

12

13

15

16

16

19

20

21

22

23

JUDGE TUTTLE: Which office -- the Constitution of the United States or the Constitution of the State of Mississippi?

MR. CLARK: Both, as he sees it, and this is the executive prerogative.

JUDGE JONES: Including the Interposition Resolution?

MR. CLARK: Judge, I don't think that -- well, of course, I am out of the argument that I had intended to make to the Court.

JUDGE TUTTLE: Yes. We are asking so many dif-M ferent questions on so many different facets of it. I still think, as I suggested maybe ten minutes ago, that we do understand your legal position on the thing.

MR. CLARK: The only thing I would say is that I have not yet gotten a chance to discuss the case of Scott vs.

Donald (165 U.S. 107) from the United States Supreme Court, which I think very clearly holds that you can't enjoin a class of constables or a class of peace officers of the State.

JUDGE TUTTLE: I am inclined to think you may be right as to our ability to enjoin to the extent that they can be cited for contempt of court for not complying with the order if they are not actually served with a copy. Isn't that what you mean?

MR. CLARK: No, sir. I mean the injunction should not issue against them under <u>Scott vs. Donald</u>.

JUDGE TUTTLE: This injunction -- we have not issued any restraining order against all to whom notice of this may come. We haven't issued that broad a restraining order, and there is no motion to issue an injunction in that language here, is there?

MR. CLARK: They are defendants in this cause, they are defendants to the preliminary restraining order, and I am saying to you now -- I don't really know what the Government is going to ask you to do -- pointing out that part of what they have asked you to do is keep any of these named officials from instituting any proceedings in civil

#### 115

action with regard to James Meredith and his attending the University of Mississippi, and in that connection one of the officials of his own organization said in Detroit, Michigan, that he was one of seventeen that had been picked to integrate the University of Mississippi, which is directly contrary to the fact that Judge Wisdom and the Court found here that he was seeking an education.

JUDGE WISDOM: And he later retracted that statement.

MR. CLARK: What I mean is there are many facets, 10 that the Court can't make or shouldn't make a final injunc-11 tion that we'll say we'll never look at again, we are just 12 going to put this one on the shelf and we are through with it forever. That is not a correct order, and I am a little at a loss to argue to you, because I don't know what kind 15 of order the Government is going say it is entitled to or 14 you should enter, if you enter any kind of injunctive order. 17 I know what the temporary restraining order said both as to 18 Meredith's action and the Government's action, and many of the things enjoined there I don't think the Court should 20 21 enjoin in the event it does decide that it has to issue some injunction, that it does have that authority to do it. I 22 have made a very poor argument on the question --23

JUDGE TUTTLE: It is not your fault, I hasten to

25 | Say.

24

MR. CLARK: -- on separation of powers, and I feel
very deeply about that, because I think it is essential to
the maintenance of a republican form of government not only
in the State of Mississippi but throughout the United States
that you do no more than move the executive authority out of
the judicial field. Certainly you have got a right to keep
a person from interfering with a judicial process, but I
don't think that is part or this same lawsuit, and that is
where we have our differences.

JUDGE BELL: I doubt if you can find anybody in
the United States that believes more in separation of powers
than I do, but I'd like you to answer this question: What
is the Government to do -- break down? -- when a court
places an order --

MR. CLARK: No, sir.

15

17

21

22

23

24

JUDGE BELL: Just break down?

MR. CLARK: No, sir. Judge, I know the Court doesn't have to accept Mississippi authority in this case, because it is a Federal question involved, but we had a judge on the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi named Judge Griffith. I don't know of any of you knew him or not.

JUDGE BELL: What is his name?

MR. CLARK: V. A. Griffith, a very great jurist.

In State vs. McPhail, 180 So. 387, he accepted the proposition that:

DIETRICH & WITT . Stenotypists . Naïl Bank of Commerce Bldg. . New Orleans

- it is true that no writ of injunction or mandamus or other judicial remedial writ will run against the Governor or any member of the Legislature, in his official capacity; but whenever they, or any of them, or any other officer acting or assuming to act for the government, puts into action any agency which comes into collision with the private personal or private property rights of any person within the jurisdiction of the state, such personal and property rights of the citizen and their infringements are always subject to inquiry and redress by the courts, as against any unauthorized act by any officer of the state, whatever his character and rank may be, and all appropriate judicial process will be directed to and against his agents or agencies -- and against the officer himself, other than those expressly above mentioned; \* \* \*\*

7

10

11

12

13

15

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

×

JUDGE TUTTLE: That may be the constitutional law of Mississippi, but I doubt whether it is the constitutional

law of the United States, I think Sterling vs. Constantin resolved that.

MR. CLARK: As to the prerogative of the judiciary to remove that encroachient upon its authority, but not to the extent of saying, Now you have to do your job in the future in any particular way, you have got to act or refrain from acting. In other words, once he encroaches into the judicial prerogative, you can move him back out of your field, but if you pursue him into the field of the executive, then I think that you have violated the Constitution of the United States.

JUDGE JONES: Mr. Clark, what should the Court have done, if anything, when the Governor of the State reads to Meredith the proclamation that he read to him as Meredith was on his way toward the doing of what this Court had said he was lawfully entitled to do?

MR. CLARK: I think that the proper action at that time would have been for the Government, instead of coming to this Court for a temporary restraining order or any other purpose, to have proceeded under authority previously granted in <u>Debs</u> to take the Governor into court to litigate that particular --

JUDGE TUTTLE: What court?

.. 16

MR. CLARK: It would have been the District Court or the Supreme Court of the United States if they claimed he

was acting for the State of Mississippi, and that is my position.

JUDGE TUTTLE: We have next the matter of the determination of whether the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor have purged themselves of contempt. You have nothing further to say on the motion for the temporary injunction, I guess, in response, rebuttal? I don't invite you to.

MR. BARRETT: I just had one or two comments, which perhaps aren't necessary.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE TUTTLE: All right. Mrs. Motley?

MRS. MOTLEY: The Appellant has nothing further.

JUDGE TUTTLE: You say you do have?

MR. BARRETT: I had one or two comments. I don't wish to take up the Court's time unnecessarily.

JUDGE TUTTLE: Well, all right. Let's get to the next issue then. What is your position with respect to whether the Governor has purged himself?

MR. MARSHALL: Judge Tuttle, I was not here in court the other day. I understood that the Court deferred that matter until today.

JUDGE TUTTLE: That is right.

MR. MARSHALL: So that the Governor could make a further showing to the Court on what he had done to purge himself, and I don't have any position until I hear what "

further showing they make.

JUDGE TUTTLE: I understood -- I inquired of Counsel for the Governor this morning -- that the answer was -- well, what is your position as to any showing on behalf of Governor Barnett to the effect that he has purged himself from the contempt under the finding of this Court that he was in contempt of court?

MR. CIARK: Judge, we had no such obligation. I didn't realize when we continued the cause the other day it was continued for some further showing. We came before the Court at that time and made a statement to the Court concerning what the situation was and what the Governor's position was, appearing for him with regard to the civil contempt action that had been brought against him, and I did not understand that we were in the interim to come in with any further showing or any further action. I thought we were just to come back to this Court today.

JUDGE TUTTLE: So that whatever showing you made on behalf of the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor last week is the only showing you are now prepared to make?

MR. CLARK: That is correct, sir.

JUDGE TUTTLE: We did invite you or give you the opportunity to make such other showing, I am sure, as you saw fit to make.

MR. CLARK: I am sure that the Court didn't

indicate it wouldn't hear us on it, no, sir, but I just did not realize that we were required to come forward with anything additional at this time.

JUDGE TUTTLE: So that if what you stated to the Court last week is to be considered now by the Court, that is your complete showing on that subject?

MR. CLARK: I would say this, Your Honor --

JUDGE TUTTLE: I am not trying to trap you in any way. I just want to be sure.

MR. CLARK: No. I am very easily trapped, but I don't have any place to go except to tell you very frankly that the Governor's position is that the orders of the Court required Meredith to be admitted to the University. He was admitted. They required that he be permitted to continue there without interference from the Governor, and he has not been interfered with by the Governor, and that is as far as the Governor's powers and prerogatives are concerned.

I think perhaps this would be the time to tell Your Honors of the legal situation and of the statutes of the State of Mississippi that I think that you should take Judicial notice of. I presume that the Court now wants us to go into the question of contempt?

JUDGE TUTTLE: Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

34

25

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir.

JUDGE RIVES: Have the proceedings that were had

DIETRICH & WITT . Stenotypists . Nat'l Bank of Commerce Bidg. . New Orleans

the other day on that question been transcribed?

MR. CLARK: Yes, Your Honor. Would you like to see a copy of the transcript?

JUDGE RIVES: Yes, sir.

MR. CLARK: If there are enough of them. I have one. Mine has some marks in it here, there, and you.

(Transcripts produced and handed to the Court.)

JUDGE WISDOM: Mr. Clark, my recollection is -- I wish you would correct me -- that on behalf of the Governor you said that he would comply with the orders of the Court, and unequivocally, without any qualification with regard to his oath as Governor of Mississippi. I don't remember that being injected in it, but I could be wrong about it.

MR. CLARK: Let me say this, Your Honor: To be perfectly candid with the Court, I was of the impression that the statements were made insofar as he was able he will comply with the laws, and I thought that my statement to the Court was to the effect that he had a paramount right or a paramount duty in his consideration to preserve peace and order in the State of Mississippi, and that he acted and would act with that paramount duty in mind; that he had not contemptuously flouted the orders of this Court because he didn't like you, but that he had done what he considered he had to do under the circumstances and his powers as Governor, and that he would continue to do that, and if the remarks

DIETRICH & WITT . Stenotypists . Net'l Benk of Commerce Bidg. . New Orleans

that were made left any other connotation with the Court, then I was in error in making them on behalf of the Governor.

JUDGE BELL: Could you take about a minute or two
just to say what the Governor's position is. I was not here.
I didn't hear that, and I haven't got a copy of the
transcript before me. Do you mind just saying it again?
What is his position?

MR. CLARK: The Governor takes the position -JUDGE BELL: I am talking about with regard to
obeying this -- not only the 28th of July order but the
temporary restraining order.

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir. The Governor's position is that he will do everything that he can do legally to preserve peace and order in the State of Mississippi.

JUDGE JONES: Has he been advised by Counsel that any portion of either of the orders is legal?

MR. CLARK: I am trying to think whether I can answer your question. My answer to you would have to be to my knowledge. I am not the Governor's sole counsel and there are many occasions when counsel that represent him have been with him at which I have not been present.

JUDGE RIVES: Mr. Clark, it still holds true that I asked the Attorney General last week, quoting from the transcript:

"I understand, Mr. Attorney General,

#### 

you assure us as Attorney General of the State and as attorney for the Lieutenant Governor and for the Governor, that to the best of their ability, they will maintain law and order and will comply with the orders of this Court?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, sir."

That remains true?

MR. CLARK: That is certainly what was said, Your Honor, no doubt about it.

MR. CLARK: That is what I want to get to, sir, the point that I make with you, sir. If you put any other connotation on that statement on behalf of the Governor other than that he will discharge the duties of his office and keep peace and order and that he has no contempt for this Court's order and when he does not consider in his executive prerogative that the orders of this Court would result in disorder or a breach of the peace, that he would comply with it.

JUDGE RIVES: What you are saying is that these words, "to the best of their ability," include the Governor's construction as to what is legal and what is not legal rather than what the Court told them to do. Is that right?

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir, that should be corrected to

DIETRICH & WITT . Stenotypists . Nat'l Bank of Commerce Bidg. . New Orleans

that extent if there was any other connotation placed on them.

JUDGE BELL: That is the position he has been taking all the time, Mr. Clark. About a week there he took the position he was going to have disorder in Mississippi if Meredith got in the University and that he was trying to preserve law and order and save human life and that sort of thing, and that was the basis of his action, and apparently that is still it.

JUDGE JONES: And if another mob forms, in order to avoid violence he will see that Meredith is taken out of the University of Mississippi.

JUDGE BELL: I came down here to this hearing -JUDGE RIVES: You may need this (transcript). I
didn't mean to deprive you of it.

MR. CLARK: Don't misunderstand. I don't question the accuracy of the transcript of what was said --

JUDGE RIVES: Yes.

MR. CLARK: -- but I do think that the position ought to be emphatically and clearly presented.

JUDGE RIVES: That is not my understanding of the meaning. My understanding of the meaning is that the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor to the best of their ability would comply with the orders of the Court, and that you tell us is not true now?

MR. CLARK: I tell you, sir, that the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor will, to the best of their ability, preserve peace and order, discharge the duties of their office as they think the oath requires, and comply with the orders of this Court that they don't find in their discretion come into conflict with that. In other words, without disputing or getting into a dispute about what was said, that is what the position of the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor is before this Court at this moment.

JUDGE BROWN: Isn't your statement an impossible one to accept, in this sense, that on its own terms, on its own terms, the Governor by virtue of his office as Governor and the duties imposed on him by Mississippi law must determine when it is that obedience to the court decree will cause a breach of the peace? Now have I stated it correctly?

MR. CLARK: I would say this: There is a fundamental difference or dichotomy in the Mississippi Law. The Governor is not a peace officer in the State of Mississippi as such. He has an executive responsibility as the chief executive that would possibly give him a prerogative to act to preserve peace in the State in the way that he thinks is best, but in a local situation, with regard to the call-out of the militia, which is the only activity or the only police force that he has, I have the statutes here on the complete control -- if somebody creates some disturbance on

a highway or road leading into a campus, then the highway patrolmen of the State of Mississippi --

Very fundamental question -- I am not lecturing you, whatever your answer might be -- do I understand now your
position is, the Governor's position is, that he will to the
best of his ability enforce the orders of this Court and not
resist them unless, in his judgment as Chief Executive of the
State of Mississippi, he determines that compliance with them
or enforcement would cause a breach of the peace?

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir.

JUDGE BROWN: Well, now, that is impossible, isn't it? That is to say that a governor or the President of the United States or a senator can determine when it is that a court's order is to be obeyed. I am putting it that way, because I don't see now much escape from a finding that he has not even begun to purge himself.

MR. CLARK: If Your Honor please, I would say this: You included more people than I had encompassed in my own view of what I was saying when you went into the legislative branch, but I see no real reason at the moment why your statement would be inaccurate as to them, but as to the executive of a state, I think that he has a responsibility or an obligation as the executive, and if he chooses to discharge it in a way that interferes with this Court's

adjudication of a right to any person or any right at all, then I think that appropriate action can be taken to get that obstruction as to what you have declared to be justice in this case out of the way.

JUDGE TUTTLE: Without affecting the Governor, without removing him from office, without in effect impeaching him?

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

. 24

25

JUDGE WISDOM: Mr. Clark, let me call your attention to the specifics of the order. Now I was here the other day, and my recollection is the same as Judge Rives! and incidentally Judge Rives read the language of the order to you and asked you -- a, b, and c -- and asked, now what about this, for example, "to cease forthwith all resistance and interference with the orders of this Court and of the District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi." Judge Rives read that to you and said, "Is it the Governor's intention to comply with that?" "Yes," you answered. "(b) to maintain law and order at and around the University and to cooperate with the officers and agents of this Court and of the United States in the execution of the orders of this Court and of the District Court of the Southern District of Mississippi to the end that James H. Meredith is permitted to register and remain as a student at the University of Mississippi under the same conditions as apply to all other students." Now you said yes to that. Now you say no, not

DIETRICH & WITT . Stenotypists . Nat'l Bank of Commerce Ridg. . New Orleans

if the Governor thinks that there may be some disorder?

MR. CLARK: That is correct, sir. The answer was, "Insofar as he is physically able to do so, Your Honor." That was the answer given to that specific question.

JUDGE WISDOM: That was the answer given, but "physically able to do so" doesn't carry any connotation to me that if it is his opinion there is going to be disorder, he is not going to obey that order.

JUDGE RIVES: I didn't get it that the Governor was to substitute his judgment for the judgment of the Court --

MR. CLARK: I understand that.

11

12

13

14

15

. 19

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE RIVES: -- as to whether to obey the order. And now you tell us he is?

MR. CLARK: I understand both your connotation and your present disposition about the matter, and I would say 17 that the construction that was placed on it by you was a construction that the attorneys before you had no authority to convey, and the one that I convey to you now is correct.

> JUDGE BELL: Do you have authority to convey that? JUDGE RIVES: Is that true as to --

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir.

JUDGE RIVES: -- Lieutenant Governor Johnson also?

MR. CLARK: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE WISDOM: Mr. Clark, the Lieutenant Governor

was widely quoted in the paper as saying that he would not order any cooperation should the troops and marshals be withdrawn, so I take it that really represents the position now of the Lieutenant Governor and the Governor?

MR. CLARK: Well, that would be -- the Lieutenant Governor's there would be about like my own would be if I had said that, because he doesn't -- when the Governor is in the state and acting, he is the President of the Senate, and that is his only function.

JUDGE WISDOM: I understand that.

.14

MR. CLARK: But his position as far as announcing to this Court or making an announcement to this Court, his position is identical with the Governor's -- or -- I have too many words -- his position is the identical position that the Governor takes, if he should be vested with the authority to make a gubernatorial decision or the executive decision.

JUDGE JONES: The Court did not correctly understand what you represented on the prior hearing.

MR. CLARK: I would say, sir, that either that or I misrepresented --

JUDGE JONES: I think you said you didn't have the authority to make that statement.

MR. CLARK: I would say -- I don't know whether you'd want to call it a mistake -- it wasn't a misrepre-

sentation, I didn't misrepresent to the Court.

JUDGE BELL: No.

MR. CLARK: But I say to you whatever connotation you put on the comments outside of what I have just delineated is an improper connotation that was not intended to be announced to the Court.

JUDGE TUTTLE: The Attorney General's representations were just as positive as yours or more so. It is a very serious matter. This Court convened today and delay was had from last Monday or Tuesday a week ago based on that representation, Mr. Clark.

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir.

JUDGE TUTTIE: And I am not critical of any of the lawyers in the case at all, I am seriously not critical of you, but for the Court to delay action based on a very positive and final statement and set it down again for the Court en banc, as it has, and for us to come to the end of this long hearing and now find that the position of the Governor is different from what was represented to the Court when the delay was granted creates a very serious problem, --

MR. CLARK: I understand, sir.

JUDGE TUTTLE: -- as you well understand, but I do understand that you now tell us the Governor and Lieutenant Governor are not now in a position or are not now willing to say that they will, so far as physically possible to them,

comply with the precise terms of our order in which we gave them the right to purge themselves from contempt?

MR. CLARK: Your Honor now is speaking of future compliance?

JUDGE TUTTLE: Yes, sir.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

×

25

MR. CLARK: I cannot make that assurance. I cannot tell you that the terms of this order will be the executive decision of the Governor or the Lieutenant Governor, if he should have the executive decision to make.

JUDGE BROWN: Then as a minimum doesn't it require

-- I shouldn't put you in that position, but we will see
what you have to say to this as an advocate -- are we not
required then to go down, a, b, c, and spell out the precise
things the Governor must do to clear this record so that he
once again assumes the position of a leader for law and
order? That starts with the rescission of every one of
those resolutions, and positive instructions to the highway
patrol --

JUDGE WISDOM: Proclamations.

JUDGE BROWN: -- to the law enforcement authorities that they will take the following steps, one of which is to maintain law and order, not cooperate but maintain law and order on the campus.

MR. CLARK: We have a difference of opinion with regard to what the legal effect of the Court's order is.

to you --

MR. CLARK: I think that the purge order cannot extend the term of the injunction, and I would say only that he cannot be disobedient to the Court's injunction without being in violation of the Court's injunction, and then the process that would be used to remove or test the validity of the two positions --

JUDGE BROWN: You are not trying to say when a man has been found guilty of contempt the Court cannot require affirmative action which was not within the precise terms of the prior order he disobeyed, if that is necessary to eradicate the force and effect of his disobedience?

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir, I am.

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

25

JUDGE BROWN: Well, I'd like to see that law.

JUDGE JONES: And call it by whatever name you want to, it seems to me it is still interposition.

JUDGE BROWN: What did they do in Dollar vs.

Sawyer? There were a lot of new people. They told the Solicitor General of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, told the Bank President, told the President of American Dollar Steamship Line, exactly what to do to eradicate the resistance that had been given to that court decree.

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir, and I don't say that the

Court does not have the absolute power to make purge terms or purge conditions. I only say that you don't have the right, if I understood you, to go outside of the terms of the injunction on which the contempt was based, the order on which the contempt was based, and, of course, this is my position with regard to --

JUDGE TUTTLE: You will have to argue that point.

MR. CLARK: Terminal Railway, sir, is what I had in mind.

this argument. We came over here. I thought we were going to get this straightened out today. I came all the way from Jacksonville. We are just tilting with windmills. I have great sympathy for you, Mr. Clark, but you may agree to something here today and when you get back to Jackson you may write a letter that you didn't have the authority to go that far. I don't see that we are getting anywhere. I can't cut you off -- certainly one judge can't do that -- but where are we getting? Every time we have a hearing the terms change.

JUDGE BROWN: How do we get Governor Barnett to come here and tell us in his own words what he intends to do, or in writing?

MR. CLARK: Would it be appropriate to ask the Court at this moment, in response to Judge Brown's question,

DIETRICH & WITT . Stenotypists . Net'l Bank of Commerce Bidg. . New Orleans

to give me a five-minute recess and I will confer with my fellow counsel, or a ten-minute recess, and then I will make a response to that question?

JUDGE TUTTLE: Yes. The Court will take a tenminute recess,

JUDGE GEWIN: Could I ask him one question before then?

JUDGE TUTTLE: Yes, sir.

JUDGE GEWIN: You were present in court, I believe, and had made some statements, and Judge Rives, addressing Attorney General Mr. Patterson, said this:

\*JUDGE RIVES: I understand, Mr.
Attorney General, you assure us as
Attorney General of the State and as
attorney for the Lieutenant Governor
and for the Governor, that to the best
of their ability, they will maintain
law and order and will comply with the

"MR. PATTERSON: Yes, sir."

orders of this Court?

You remember that?

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir, that is correct.

JUDGE GEWIN: And were you there present, and you and the Attorney General were associated together in -
MR. CLARK: Correct.

JUDGE GEWIN: -- in making that statement, whatever it means, to this Court?

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir.

JUDGE GEWIN: And you approved it at that time?

MR. CLARK: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE GEWIN: And stated to the Court, you and Mr. Patterson and Mr. Satterfield, that as officers of the Court you made that recommendation to us?

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir.

JUDGE GEWIN: Speak out, sir.

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

JUDGE GEWIN: And that was made with the authority of the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor?

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir.

JUDGE GEWIN: And that was your position at that time, whatever the meaning of these words is?

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir.

JUDGE GEWIN: All right, sir.

JUDGE RIVES: But now you retract it?

MR. CLARK: To the extent --

JUDGE RIVES: Or qualify it?

MR. CLARK: If you put a different connotation on it, qualify it to the extent of what I have said to the Court here today.

JUDGE BELL: You have been very candid.

....Thereupon, at 3:10 o'clock p.m., a ten-minute recess was taken, until 3:20 o'clock p.m....

### AFTER THE RECESS:

. 14

JUDGE TUTTLE: You may proceed.

MR. CLARK: Your Honor please, when we asked for a ten-minute recess, we did so with the intention of making a telephone call. That call has had some difficulty in going through. I am not yet prepared to answer the question at this instant. If the Court cares to question me further about the proceedings or if it cares to hear with regard to the contempt proceedings some observations on the quality of the order that was entered, particularly with regard to fine and imprisonment, or, -- in other words, is there anything that I could do for a moment until I can get adequate communication so we won't have to have any possible misunder-standing about the filing of a written statement?

JUDGE TUTTLE: What is the nature of the inquiry you are proposing to make of the Governor? I think the Court is entitled to that much.

MR. CLARK: With regard to whether or not there will be a written reply in response to what Judge Brown asked, will he set down in a written statement to this Court over his signature before the Secretary of State or in some